

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

Qian Williams,	:	
	:	Case No. 1:22-cv-001
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	Judge Susan J. Dlott
v.	:	
	:	Order Adopting Report and
Chris Miniard, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	Recommendation and
	:	Denying Motions to Amend Complaint
Defendants.	:	

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation issued by Magistrate Judge Karen L. Litkovitz on January 10, 2023. (Doc. 66.) The Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court deny Plaintiff Qian Williams’s Motions to Amend Complaint (Docs. 42, 47), both filed after the dispositive motion deadline. (Doc. 66 at PageID 731–735.) She found that the Motions to Amend were untimely and filed without good cause for the untimeliness. (*Id.* at PageID 734.) She faulted him for failing to attach proposed Amended Complaints to the Motions. (*Id.*) Finally, to the extent that Williams sought to add new defendants, she concluded that the proposed amended claims were barred by the applicable statutes of limitations. (*Id.* at PageID 735.) Williams failed to timely file objections to the Report and Recommendation.

Magistrate judges are authorized to decide dispositive and non-dispositive matters pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. If a party timely files objections to a magistrate judge’s decision on a nondispositive matter, a district judge must “modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). If a party files objections to a report and recommendation on a dispositive matter, a district judge must review it under the *de novo* standard. *Baker v. Peterson*, 67 F. App’x 308, 310 (6th Cir. 2003). However, “[t]he district court is not required to review,

under a *de novo* or any other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made.” *Weir v. Centurion*, No. 3:19-CV-00131, 2021 WL 5165930, at \*1 (M.D. Tenn. Nov. 5, 2021). “The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (substantially similar).

Here, the Court has reviewed *de novo* the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation to deny the Motions to Amend, though no timely objections were filed. The Court concurs with the Magistrate Judge’s well-reasoned analysis. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 66) is **ADOPTED**, and the Motions to Amend (Docs. 42, 47) are **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

BY THE COURT:

S/Susan J. Dlott  
Susan J. Dlott  
United States District Judge